

## Status update

**Brattin, Bill** to: Benson.Bob

06/28/2012 11:42 AM

From: "Brattin, Bill" <brattin@srcinc.com>

To:

Cc: Berry.David@epamail.epa.gov

---

I talked to UC today.  
Here are highlights

- 1) They still think GM is better than AM, and show little tendency to be convinced otherwise. However, they agree doing calcs based on AM is one option.
  - 2) They agree that fitting IH data by year to an exponential is good, but they recommend using a variance-weighted fitting. I have done this, and I do not like the results. This will need more discussion.
  - 3) They prefer fitting each data set individually, and not forcing the b terms to be equal. That is OK with me.
  - 4) They are not convinced that the high concentration values in short duration samples is a problem, and even if it were, they do not think anything can be done. I suggested a sensitivity calc to see what would happen if these samples were excluded, and they agreed it might be informative. We both expect the impact would be small.
  - 5) They agree the one very high value in the background data set should be excluded as an outlier
  - 6) They agree with the way I adjusted for vermiculite source (i.e., they agree with the method for creating the JEM)
- Jim and Grace will be gone to Alaska for 2 weeks, starting tomorrow.  
Here are times they suggest for a call with EPA when they get back:  
Monday 7/16 11:30 -2 pm EST  
Monday 7/23 10-Noon EST

\*\*\*\*\*

Bill Brattin

SRC, Inc.

999 18th Street Suite 1150

Denver CO 80202

Phone: 303-357-3121

Fax: 303-292-4755

e-mail: brattin@srcinc.com<mailto:brattin@syrres.com>



- winmail.dat